

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24 are rejected. Claims 3, 4, 11, 13, 14, 19 and 20 are cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 1, 10 and 18 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On January 21, 2005, Matthew J. Blecher and Anthony C. Murabito, Attorneys for the Applicants, and Examiner Mansour Said and Primary Examiner Vijay Shankar participated in a telephonic interview to discuss the rejection of Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-24. First, the claim limitation of a slot having an opening at one end, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10, was discussed. Mr. Blecher explained that Izutani, the primary reference, could not be modified to include a slot having an opening at one end, as this modification would render Izutani inoperable. Next, the claim limitation of a computer system having a slot for receiving a hinge attached to a protective cover, as recited in independent Claim 18 was discussed. Mr. Blecher contended that none of the cited references showed or described a slot for receiving a hinge attached to a protective cover.

In light of the discussion of Claims 1, 10 and 18, Examiners Said and Shankar indicated that amending the Claims to include the type of detector

Serial No.: 09/522,274

Examiner: Said, Mansour
Art Unit: 2673

would place the claims in condition for allowance. Specifically, it was decided that amending Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 3 would make Claim 1 allowable, amending Claim 10 to include the limitations of Claim 14 would make Claim 10 allowable, and amending Claim 18 to include the limitations of Claim 20 would make Claim 18 allowable. Applicants submit that the discussed amendments have been made herein, and that the application is thus in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 5,483,262 by Izutani, hereinafter referred to as the "Izutani" reference, in view of United States Patent in view of United States Patent 5,067,573 by Uchida, hereinafter referred to as the "Uchida" reference. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 3 and amended Claim 10 to include the limitations of Claim 14, which were indicated by the Examiner as being allowable during the Examiner Interview of January 21, 2005. Therefore, a discussion of the rejection of Claims 1 and 10 is moot, as Claims 1 and 10 have been placed in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5, 7, 16 and 17 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims.

Claims 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of United States Patent 6,100,538 by Ogawa et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Ogawa” reference. Claim 6 is dependent on Claim 1, and Claim 15 is dependent on Claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6 and 15 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of United States Patent 5,049,862 by Dao et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Dao” reference. Claim 8 is dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 8 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of United States Patent 5,756,941 by Snell. Claim 9 is dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Claim 9 is dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 18, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani in view of Uchida. Applicants have amended Claim 18 to include the limitations of Claim 20 that was indicated by the Examiner as being allowable during the Examiner Interview of January 21, 2005. Therefore, a discussion of the rejection of Claim 18 is moot, as Claim 18 has been placed in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21 and 23 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of Ogawa. Claim 22 is dependent on allowable base Claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 22 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani and Uchida, further in view of Dao. Claim 24 is dependent on allowable base Claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 24 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as this claim is dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 5-10, 15-18 and 21-24 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 21 Jan, 2005



Matthew J. Blecher
Registration No. 46,558

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060